



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,850	07/15/2003	Philip E. Thorpe	4001.003082	2541

52101 7590 05/16/2006

PEREGRINE PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.  
5353 WEST ALABAMA  
SUITE 306  
HOUSTON, TX 77056

EXAMINER

YAO, LEI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1642

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/620,850

Applicant(s)

THORPE ET AL.

Examiner

Lei Yao, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8, 10-11 and 14-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9, 12 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 1642

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claim 1-13) in the reply filed on 9/15/2005 is acknowledged.

Applicants state that upon allowance of a product claim, withdrawn process claims that include all limitations of the allowed product claim, will be rejoined in the case as a matter of right.

Applicants are advised that the process claims of Group II upon the allowable product claims of Group I will be rejoined in accordance with MPEP described in the restriction requirement of prior Office action filed 9/15/06 and again as the following:

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitation of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitation of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 C.F.R. 1.312.

In the event of a rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet the criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. 103(b), 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or otherwise include the limitation of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

In addition, in the species election requirement, Applicants select unconjugated or naked antibody in composition without a second anti-cancer agent, which is also applicable to immunoconjugate in claim 1. Thus, Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 14-19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention and claims 6-8 and 10-11 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claims 1-5, 9 and 12-13 without species of immunoconjugate and second anti-cancer agent are under the consideration at this time.

***Priority***

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application); the disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Applicant's claims to an earlier effective filing date through US none-provisional application, 09/613430 ('430), filed on 7/10/00 is Acknowledged. However, upon review of the specification of the application, it is noted that the application did not disclose a composition or a kit comprising an anti-phosphatidylserine or anti-aminophospholipid antibody 3G4 (produced by hybridoma ATCC PTA 4545). Therefore, for the purposes of examining this application, the examiner has established the effective priority dated as July 15, 2002, the filing dated of the instant application. If applicants disagree with any rejection set forth in this office action base on this priority date, applicant is invited to submit evidence pointing to the serial number, page and line where support can be found establishing an earlier priority date.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

**As drawn to deposit:**

Claims 1-5, 9 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention and failing to provide an enabling disclosure without

Art Unit: 1642

complete evidence either that the claimed biological materials are known and readily available to the public or complete evidence of the deposit of the biological materials.

The specification lacks complete deposit information for the deposit of hybridoma ATCC PTA 4545, producing antibodies 3G4. It is not clear that the antibody possessing the identical properties of 3G4 are known and publicly available or can be reproducibly isolated from nature without undue experimentation.

Exact replication of a cell line is an unpredictable event. Although applicant has provided a written description of a method for selecting the claimed hybridoma cell lines and monoclonal antibodies, this method will not necessarily reproduce antibodies and hybridomas which are chemically and structurally identical to those claimed. It is unclear that one of skill in the art could derive a monoclonal antibody and hybridoma identical to those claimed. Undue experimentation would be required to screen all of the possible antibody and hybridoma species to obtain the claimed antibodies and hybridomas.

Because one of ordinary skill in the art could not be assured of the ability to practice the invention as claimed in the absence of the availability of the claimed antibody, a suitable deposit of hybridoma cell lines producing antibodies 3G4 for patent purposes, evidence of public availability of the claimed antibodies or evidence of the reproducibility without undue experimentation of the claimed invention, is required.

Applicant's referral to the deposits of hybridoma cell lines producing antibodies 3G4 on page 10, paragraphs 1-2 of the specification is an insufficient assurance that the required deposit has been made and all the conditions of 37 CFR 1.801-1.809 met.

If the hybridoma cell line (ATCC PTA 4545) producing antibody 3G4, deposited at ATCC deposit are made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, filing of an affidavit or declaration by applicant or assignees or a statement by an attorney of record who has authority and control over the conditions of deposit over his or her signature and registration number stating that the deposits of hybridoma cell line producing antibodies 3G4 has been accepted by an International Depository Authority under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty and that all restrictions upon public access to the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the grant of a patent on this application. This requirement is necessary

Art Unit: 1642

when deposits are made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty as the Treaty leaves this specific matter to the discretion of each State.

If the deposits of the hybridoma cell line producing antibodies 3G4 are not made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposits comply with the criteria set forth in 37 CFR 1.801-1.809 regarding availability and permanency of deposits, assurance of compliance is required. Such assurance may be in the form of an affidavit or declaration by applicants or assignees or in the form of a statement by an attorney of record who has the authority and control over the conditions of deposit over his or her signature and registration number averring:

(a) during the pendency of this application, access to the deposits will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request:

(b) all restrictions upon the availability to the public of the deposited biological material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent on this application:

(c) the deposits will be maintained in a public depository for a period of at least thirty years from the date of deposit or for the enforceable life of the patent of or for a period of five years after the date of the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited biological material, whichever is longest; and

(d) the deposits will be replaced if they should become nonviable or non-replicable.

Amendment of the specification to recite the date of deposit and the complete name and address of the depository is required. As an additional means for completing the record, applicant may submit a copy of the contract with the depository for deposit and maintenance of each deposit.

If a deposit is made after the effective filing date of the application for patent in the United States, a verified statement is required from a person in a position to corroborate that the biological material described in the specification as filed is the same as that deposited in the depository, stating that the deposited material is identical to the biological material described in the specification and was in the applicant's possession at the time the application was filed.

Applicant's attention is directed to *In re Lundak*, 773 F.2d. 1216, 227 USPQ 90 (CAFC 1985) and 37 CFR 1.801-1.809 for further information concerning deposit practice.

Art Unit: 1642

**Conclusion**

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lei Yao, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-3112. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-4.30pm Monday to Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature, matching or file papers or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Kim Downing for Art Unit 1642 whose telephone number is 571-272-0521

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Siew can be reached on 571-272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lei Yao, Ph.D.  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1642

LY

  
SHEELA HUFF  
PRIMARY EXAMINER